



U.S.S.N 10/025,524

Attorney Docket No. 27866/34162A

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: Kilgannon et al.

Serial No. 10/025,524

Filed: December 18, 2001

Title: ICAM-4 Materials and Methods

Group Art Unit: 1645

Examiner: Patricia Duffy

) **Certificate of First Class Mailing**

)
) I hereby certify that this paper is
) being filed by First Class Mail in an
) envelope, postage prepaid, addressed
) to Commissioner for Patents, P.O.
) Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-
) 1450, on this date:
) March 10, 2004

)
) 
)
) Katherine L. Neville, Ph.D.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In an Office Action mailed November 18, 2003, pending claims 23 through 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs, for assertedly lacking written description and for asserted indefiniteness. The Examiner rejects claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as assertedly unpatentable in view of Bailly *et al.*, (Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 91:5306-10, 1994) and Bailly *et al.*, (Eur. J. Immunol. 25:3316-20, 1995). The claims were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) and 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as assertedly unpatentable in light of Oka *et al.*, (Neuroscience 35:93-103, 1990) (hereinafter "Oka"), in view of Yoshihara *et al.*, (Neuron, 12:541-44, 1994) (hereinafter "Yoshihara") and Goding *et al.*, (Monoclonal Antibodies, 1983 Academic Press Inc.) (hereinafter "Goding"). Claim 27 was rejected under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. In view of the following amendments and remarks, reconsideration is respectfully requested.